



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,063	11/12/2003	Kazuhiko Hidaka	791_127 DIV	6360
25191	7590	02/02/2005	EXAMINER	
BURR & BROWN PO BOX 7068 SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068			DEL SOLE, JOSEPH S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1722	
DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/706,063	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HIDAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joseph S. Del Sole	<b>Art Unit</b> 1722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/768,891.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/12/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. This application filed under former 37 CFR 1.60 lacks the necessary reference to the prior application. The current status of the nonprovisional parent application referenced should be included.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is vague and indefinite because "slit forming member is arranged so as to protrude slit forming member outwardly" is grammatically awkward and unclear.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horikawa et al (5,149,475).

Horikawa et al teach an apparatus for manufacturing a honeycomb structure (Fig 4a) having slits (Figs 3a - 3d) and a plurality of arrays of numerous cells aligned in

Art Unit: 1722

parallel (Figs 3a - 3d), the slits communicating with external space and being formed along the cell arrays; having an extruder (Fig 4a, #5) having an extruding die for a honeycomb structure; a slit forming member (Fig 4a, #7) arranged near the extruding die and protruding along arrays of a molded article being extruded in which slits are to be formed (Fig 4a); the slit forming member is arranged to protrude inwardly toward the extruding die (Fig 4a); the slit forming member is arranged to protrude outwardly toward the extruding die (Fig 4a); the slit forming member is a J-shaped bit (Fig 4a).

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yorita et al (5,855,781).

Yorita teaches an apparatus for manufacturing a honeycomb structure (abstract and Figure 5) having slits (abstract and Figure 5) and a plurality of arrays of numerous cells aligned in parallel (abstract and Figure 5), the slits communicating with external space and being formed along the cell arrays (col 2, lines 18-23 and Figure 5); having an extruder (col 7, lines 29-33) having an extruding die for a honeycomb structure; a slit forming member (since Yorita et al states that the die has a cross-section to form the grooves/ slits, Yorita has a die that has a protruding slit forming member) arranged near the extruding die and protruding along arrays of a molded article being extruded in which slits are to be formed; the slit forming member is arranged to protrude inwardly toward the extruding die; the slit forming member is arranged to protrude outwardly toward the extruding die.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 5 -8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horikawa et al (5,149,475).

Horikawa et al teaches the apparatus as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1722

Horikawa et al fails to explicitly teach monitoring means for monitoring a position of the molded article being extruded and control means for controlling actions of the slit forming member.

Horikawa et al does however teach that the cutting tool is vertically moved into position along the extrudate to form a predetermined notch (col 3, lines 50-61 and Figs 4-5), therefore it is inherent that monitoring takes place in Horikawa et al for the purpose of the cutting tool to be positioned at the desired location along the extrudate for the purpose of the notch to be formed at the desired location.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have monitored and controlled the cutting tool because it enables a notch to be formed in a desired location.

#### ***References of Interest***

11. Shibagaki et al is cited of interest to show the state of the art.

#### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Joseph S. Del Sole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Benjamin Utech, can be reached at (571) 272-1137. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for both non-after finals and for after finals.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from the either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Joseph S. Del Sole*  
J.S.D.  
January 28, 2005